

BUILDING DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Minutes of July 19, 2016 Meeting

Jonathan Bahr opened the Building-Development Commission (BDC) meeting at 3:05 p.m. on Tuesday, July 19th 2016.

Present: Jonathan Bahr, Travis Haston, Chad Askew, Tom Brasse, Melanie Coyne, Michael Stephenson, John Taylor, Ben Simpson Hal Hester, Rob Belisle, Terry Knotts and Scott Shelton

Absent: Rodney Kiser, Wanda Towler

1. Ebenezer Gujjarlapudi informed BDC members that the new Code Enforcement Director position has now been filled by Patrick Granson beginning September 1st 2016. After a nationwide search, it is clear that Patrick was the best candidate for the job. Patrick has been instrumental in the growth of the Department over the last 20 years. Eb went on to thank Jim Bartl for all of his hard work and dedication in driving Code Enforcement to its current day success. Jim's work since 1996 has been tremendous. Mr. Bartl's last day with Code Enforcement will be January 31, 2017.

1.1 MINUTES APPROVED

Travis Haston made the motion to approve the minutes from the June 21st Building Development Commission Meeting; seconded by John Taylor. The motion passed unanimously.

2. BDC MEMBER ISSUES & INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION ISSUES

Chad Askew shared with the Board that his term is up and decisions are pending with AIA Charlotte on Board representation.

Michael Stephenson shared that the GCAA quarterly Code Meeting was held on July 13th and thanked those that were able to attend.

Travis Haston thanked the inspection team for accommodating everyone on a daily basis given the workload we all have, it is much appreciated.

Jonathan Bahr introduced Terry Knotts as the new Small Business Chamber of Commerce Representative to the BDC saying that Terry is a Graduate of Indiana University, has been a contractor and developer since 1974 and has served on CMUD/Developer Liaison Committee since 1991.

Terry Knotts said he is very glad to be here and will reserve comments until he is more familiar with the process.

Tom Brasse asked for an update on POSSE-Winchester. Jim shared schedule is ready to go live on July 25th. Last word from IT is that it is going well and will roll out live on schedule.

3. PUBLIC ATTENDEE ISSUES

No public attendee issues.

4. AMENDED BEST PRACTICE ON PLAN SUBMITTAL & REVIEW

This is a TF detail discussion, building on the AE Best Practice Subcomm report delivered to the BDC on June 17, 2015 and the amendment to those recommendations reviewed with you on April 19. In our April 19 review the BDC had no objections to the clarifications and amendments, so the Dept has continued working on the details regarding several AE Subcomm requests.

- a) OnSchedule plan reviews failing 3rd cycle
- b) Expedited Process for Superior Performing Team on Inspector Driven RTAPs

- c) Strategy on 1st time customer preliminary review follow up.
- d) Dealing with repeat gate offenders
- e) Plus, the added Revit best practice, we described briefly on April 19

Today's presentation will; review these proposed changes in greater detail, summarize additional staff required to support the change, field BDC question on these last of the tweaks to the plan submittal and review best practice agreement between the Department and AE's.

Program Description: this new initiative will address projects with difficulty meeting code compliance after the third review cycle in Building, Electrical, Mechanical and Plumbing (BEMP). Currently, 3-5% of our work volume falls within the third review cycle of OnSchedule.

How it will work: at the conclusion of the third cycle review if Building, Electrical, Mechanical or Plumbing (B/E/M/P) disapproves the project, a mandatory exit meeting will be scheduled with the appropriate trades to discuss the outstanding code issues. After the exit meeting, an entrance meeting will be required before the project will be accepted for the fourth cycle review. This process would continue for every subsequent cycle after the fourth.

Expedited Process for Superior Performing Team on Inspector Driven RTAPs

Program Description: this particular initiative was discussed in the AE Best Practice Subcommittee reflecting two requested recommendations. One is to reduce review times for RTAP projects having owner driven field changes and critical timelines to help facilitate review of changes and complete the construction phase; helping identify and balance changes that are "minor in nature" in an expedited review process. The second is to take advantage of the AE grading tool, currently in place, for those AE's who consistently perform at high levels since the inception of the AE grading tool roll-out. AE's have suggested the creation of an additional tier in their grading scale to identify those who have proven themselves. They would like the benefit of a faster process for high level performance added to the current tier structure.

How it will work: the AE grading program has three primary tiers of grading; Superior, Successful and Poor. The Superior group has received added benefits since the start, including Team Plan Review option, an option for walk through services on small projects, and Review Schedule Preference (first available slots). This will add a new benefit to that list. Implementation will include the creation of an additional line of service delivery within the current system, identifying superior teams' projects, then dedicating hours for expedited review times for RTAP Superior performer projects. Based on receipt of current RTAP submittals, this will take approximately 100 hours for all trades.

Strategy on 1st time customer preliminary review follow-up:

Program Description: as recommended by the AE Best Practice Subcommittee, this promotes follow-up communication for first time users of the preliminary review process. The plans examiner will follow-up with the Design Professional to verify progress and to discuss project code challenges needing further clarification.

How it will work: when a preliminary review meeting is held with a design team or individual team member that has never participated in a preliminary review meeting with Mecklenburg County Code

Enforcement, two weeks after the meeting the plans examiners will contact the parallel design professional to see if they have any questions.

Dealing with repeat gate offenders

Program Description: this initiative addresses the AE Best Practice Subcommittee concern that practicing professionals with a track record of submitting drawings not complying with the basic plan submittal requirements posted on the web, divert staff resources that should be available to conscientious AE's.

How it will work: if a seal holder has a Gatekeeping turn down rate of 25% or more, they will be required to schedule and attend a preliminary review to discuss the project and the packaging requirements

Added Revit "best practice" steps

Program Description: the Department assembled a group of local Architects to discuss a recurring problem on review of Revit projects, where the submittals detail was insufficient to support a code compliance review. The participating AE's suggested amendments to the "Plan Submittal and Review Best Practice Summary" currently posted in Appendix A.4 of the AE-GC-Builder Task Force Final Report, including the following steps for all AE's to follow. Minimum; print projects out on paper; PA and PM or project seal holder to check project complete. Minimum; identify a "bright line" between 3D work and the move to 2D detailing; office PA/PM's must have common agreement on where the "bright line" falls. AE's attending the meeting suggested the following. Offices should be deliberate about acknowledging the imaginary line (meaning the scale of the detail/drawing in question) where you stop showing the Revit model and simply draft with 2D lines. That's one best practice to control the level of detail that relies on Revit to produce it, which cuts down on errors. The middle scales (1/2", 1", etc.) are usually drawn using a hybrid of Revit and 2D line work. How these details get drawn comes down to a judgment call on how much to let Revit do. Ideally; hold QA/QC design session one month before delivery, on all projects.

- Include all consultants for the full meeting duration.
- Use pin up sets or other to review all details for compliance or constructability.
- Support with checklists for each discipline (site, arch, elec, mech, plbg, etc)
- After changes are made, plans go back to PA and PM or assigned seal holding principal for final check covering all disciplines.

How it will work: no added administrative support work is required; the Dept publicizes the amended AE best practice summary, noting the Revit adds; the burden is on the AE's to follow through.

Staffing; resources required to support the proposed changes

Approaching the above changes from a "bundled" perspective, required resources will include (4) Plans Examiners and (1) Plans Facilitator to coordinate, facilitate and meet the service demand projected from the above five changes.

Total estimated cost for all enhancements listed above including the addition of (4) Plans Examiners and (1) Plans Facilitator, based on 13 pay periods in Fy17:

○ 4 Plans Examiners.....	\$226,200
○ 1 Plans Facilitator.....	\$41,500
○ <u>Technology Enhancements (estimate).....</u>	<u>\$7,500</u>
Total.....	\$275,200

Unless the BDC has objections, we will assume you want us to carry out the subcommittee's recommendations. We will proceed with scheduling the supporting tech changes. A staffing RFBA will follow later (maybe October-November), after we get a sense of Fy17 revenue trends, and also inspections continued progress on IRT.

5. AE FEEDBACK TOOL EOY REPORT

From 7/1/15 thru 6/30/16, the AE Feedback tool sent 10,702 surveys to the responsible AE on a Mega or OnSchedule review discipline cycle as it closed. Results are as follows;

- 1,795 respondents; a 16.77% response rate, which is very good.
- Responses included a total of 10,907 grades (each respondent is asked 8 questions)
- 3.17% of the grades fell in the grade ranking of unacceptable-needed improvement
- 47.83% of the grades fell in the grade ranking of acceptable-met expectations
- 48.99% of the grades fell in the grade ranking of exceeded expectations-excellent-exceptional.

Brief review of high/low scores flags in the system and how managers use them to follow up with customers on problems incurred.

6. Highlighting an “unsung service hero”; TIP volume

Our permits issued load in Fy16 totaled 90,198, down 5% from Fy15 (94,897). Projected chart shows distribution among various service streams;

- IP; Internet Permits (staff intervention).....24,325
- NIP; Non-Internet Permits (paper applications).....11,521
- TIP; Trade Internet Permits (self-facilitated).....28,811
- HIP; Homeowner Internet Permits (self-facilitated).....39
- Other; Zoning, Sign & Fire Permits.....3,949
- Total.....90,198

Notable in the total is that TIP was about 32% of our total permit volume (28,811/90,198). That is the highest % ever for TIP. about 1/3 of the permits were issued instantly, as fast as the person could type. Just as important, TIP checks to assure the permits comply with the >3000 local ord business rules, something you can't buy “off the shelf”. Customers helped us design TIP; that's why it worked so well for almost 29,000 permits last year. We need to remember that when we talk about wholesale changes to the P&I technology.

7. Quarterly Reports

Commercial Plan Review report

Part I: 74% of projects pass on 1st rev'w (up from 71%); 85% passed on 2nd rev'w (up from 82%);

- pass rates on 1st review by trade:

Bldg-82% (was 82%); Elec - 89% (was 86%); Mech - 84% (was 81%); Plbg - 81% (was 81%);

Part II: most common defects: examples

- Bldg: Appendix B, UL assembly, opening protection, hardware, egress related (3)& energy summary.
- Elec: services/feeders, general, branch circuits, grounding/bonding, emergency systems, & clearances
- Mech: fresh air req't, exhausts system, duct installations, eqpt locations, secondary condensate drains.
- Plbg: plbg syst inst'l, sanitary drainage piping, venting, water distr piping & mat'ls, wtr heater inst'l.

Part III: use of “approved as noted” (AAN) at 32% by all trades on average (last quarter was 32%)

- biggest users; CFD (78%) and MCFM (74%)
- critical path users; Bldg-27% (was 32%)__, Elec- 11% (was 14%)__,

Mech-17% (was 11%)__, Plbg-18% (was 17%)__,

- So Bldg & Elec down__, Mech up__, and Plbg about the same__.

Code Compliance report

Note; all of the Department quarterly reports we're available in the drop box on Friday, July 15.

- Rough/finish % split varies, some up, some down
 - Bldg; rough @ 42.13% (was 40.38%), finish @ 19.71% (was 15.09%)
 - Elec; rough @ 24.71% (was 23.94%), finish @ 54.38% (was 50.21%)
 - Mech; rough @ 29.73% (was 32.13%), finish @ 53.12% (was 47.96%)
 - Plbg; rough @ 30% (was 26.79%), finish @ 35.9% (was 40.78%)
- "Top 20" repeating topics; Building at 87%, Electrical at 87%, Mech at 67% and Plbg at 80%

Consistency Team report

The drop box link provided to BDC members included the following summary with detailed backup for each meeting

- Building: held three sets of meetings this quarter.
 - Bldg-Residential: addressed a total of 29 questions; contractor attendance averaged 13 at each meeting.
 - Bldg-Commercial: addressed a total of 15 questions; industry attendance averaged 6 at each meeting.
- Electrical: held three consistency meetings. In total, the meetings addressed 97 topics. Contractor attendance averaged 13.
- Mechanical/Fuel Gas: held two consistency meetings, plus one special topic training session. In total, the two meetings addressed 15 topics. Contractor attendance averaged 2 persons.
 - In May, mechanical held a special class on Enclosed Crawlspace, as a result there were no Q&As. Three contractors attended the session.
- Plumbing: held three consistency meetings. In total, the meetings addressed 17 topics. Contractor attendance averaged 2 persons.

Technical Advisory Board Quarterly Report

- The TAB met on June 28 to discuss wood permit/inspection requirements for wood burning factory fireplaces.
- The discussion noted inconsistencies between language in the Meck County Building-Development Ordinance (BDO) in comparison to state licensing board requirements.
- The TAB recommended bringing the BDO in line with the state requirements. Staff is currently reviewing the BDO and preparing recommended changes.

Code Interpretation Quarterly Newsletter

At the request of the BDC & the AE-GC-Builder Task Force, in April, 2015 the CA's introduced the code interpretation quarterly newsletter, CA Quarterly. You will recall we reviewed the format with you.

- This relates to Task Force action item #16-written criteria on code interp change notification
- The Task Force Final Report calls for an "interpretation specific quarterly newsletter".
- At the end of July, we will publish the next edition covering changes in April-May-June.
- In addition to key code interpretations from the last quarter, this issue will also highlight our upcoming move to two separate building consistency meetings.

8. Quarterly BDC bulletin exercise

Previous bulletin topics:

July, 2014 Customer Service Center project status. Phased Occupancy best practice summary. Select Committee status and follow up Task Force work. Overview of the Department's work.	October, 2014 AE-GC-Builder Task Force startup and progress. MF electrical service revised DOI interpretation. Reminder on paperless review process. AE feedback tool Fy14 results. BDC Select Committee completes assignment	February, 2015 Gartner Report status. AE-GC-Builder Task Force Recommendations Best Practice summaries HCD Team progress Fy16 budget process completes assignment	April, 2015 New BDC members Customer Service Center development update LUESA office location move Subcommittee continuing work on Task Force recommendations
July, 2015 Mega Multifamily Inspections Team update Code Compliance Task Force completes assignment Code Interpretation Quarterly Newsletter New Director of Inspections. Fy16 budget approval	October, 2015 New BDC members HB255 & impact on P&I process Suttle Ave move and opening of customer service center Tracking progress on advancing Gartner/Task Force recommendations Building with our Veterans	January, 2016 Inspections re-alignment Customer Service Center opens at Suttle Ave Quarterly Reports indicate many repeating defects BOCC approves adding 20 positions.	April, 2016 Filling vacant code official positions Impact of Suttle Ave facility on customers AE Best practice and how it benefits customers Customer survey launched to define process & tech training Director transition
July, 2016 Recap of Fee Ordinance Changes Inspector Realignment Phase II New BDC Member New Building Consistency Team Meeting Schedule Director Transition			

9. June 2016 Statistics

Permit Revenue

- June permit (only) rev - \$2,594,222, compares to May permit (only) rev - \$1,897,111
- Fy16 budget projected monthly permit rev = \$1,953,190; so May is \$56k below projection
- YTD permit rev = \$25,328,157 is above projection (\$23,438,284) by \$1,889,873 or 8%.

Construction Value of Permits Issued

- Report temporarily suspended.

Permits Issued:

	May	June	3 Month Trend
Residential	5294	5971	5104/4953/5294/5971
Commercial	2590	2738	2693/2814/2590/2738
Other (Fire/Zone)	334	272	318/338/334/272
Total	8105	8981	8115/8105/8218/8981

- Changes (May-June); Residential up 12.7%__; commercial up 5.7%__; total up 10.8%__

Inspection Activity: inspections performed

Insp. Req.	May	June	Insp. Perf.	May	June	% Change
Bldg.	7712	8450	Bldg.	7743	8463	+9.3%
Elec.	8063	9230	Elec.	7456	8372	+12.3%
Mech.	4368	4833	Mech.	4150	4509	+8.7%
Plbg.	3512	3974	Plbg.	3120	3472	+11.3%
Total	23,655	26,847	Total	22,469	24,816	+10.45%

- Changes (May-June): requests up 13.5%; inspect performed up 10.45% (ranging +8.7% to 12.3%)
- Insp performed were 92.4% of insp requested__

Inspection Activity: inspections response time (new IRT report)

Insp. Resp. Time	OnTime %		Total % After 24 Hrs. Late		Total % After 48 Hrs. Late		Average Resp. in Days	
	May	June	May	June	May	June	May	June
Bldg	80.9	85.39	96.1	97.48	98.7	99.51	1.30	1.17
Elec.	69.7	68.85	95.2	95.14	99.4	99.33	1.38	1.36
Mech.	74.2	78.23	93.9	95.67	98.5	98.98	1.34	1.28
Plbg.	73.6	77.92	95.5	96.2	99.3	99.38	1.31	1.26

Total	74.7	76.6	95.3	96.0	99.0	99.4	1.34	1.28
-------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

- BMP up 4-5%; Elec down <1%
- Per the BDC Performance Goal agreement (7/20/2010), the goal range is **85-90%**; so the **June average is currently 8.4% below goal range.**

Inspection Pass Rates for June, 2016:

OVERALL MONTHLY AV'G @ 82.7% in June, compared to 81.94% in May

<u>Bldg:</u>	May – 75.86%	<u>Elec:</u>	May – 80.14%
	June – 77.37%		June – 81.65%

<u>Mech:</u>	May – 86.39%	<u>Plbg:</u>	May – 89.88%
	June – 86.08%		June – 89.01%

- Building & Elec up (about 1.5%); Mech & Plbg down <1%.
- Overall average up <1% from last month, above the 75-80% goal range.

On Schedule and CTAC numbers for June, 2016

CTAC:

- 132 first reviews, compared to 111 in May
- Projects approval rate (pass/fail) – 74%
- CTAC was 36.75% of OnSch (*) first review volume; $(132/132+187 = 319) = 41.38\%$
 *CTAC as a % of OnSch is based on the total of only scheduled and Express projects

On Schedule:

- Nov, 14: 194 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–95.6% all trades, 95.25% on B/E/M/P only
- Dec, 14: 203 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–95.25% all trades, 94.25% on B/E/M/P only
- January, 15: 185 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–92.88% all trades, 93.5% on B/E/M/P only
- February, 15: 192 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–94.75% all trades, 96.5% on B/E/M/P only
- March, 15: 210 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–95.1% all trades, 97.5% on B/E/M/P only
- April, 15: 240 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–91.5% all trades, 96.75% on B/E/M/P only
- May, 15: 238 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–95% all trades, 94.75% on B/E/M/P only
- June, 15: 251 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–94.95% all trades, 95.82% on B/E/M/P only
- July, 15: 218 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–91.1% all trades, 90.75% on B/E/M/P only
- August, 15: 215 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–91.5% all trades, 93% on B/E/M/P only
- Sept, 15: 235 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–87.12% all trades, 92.5% on B/E/M/P only
- October, 15: 229 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–91.79% all trades, 91.62% on B/E/M/P only
- November, 15: 220 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–93% all trades, 92% on B/E/M/P only
- December, 15: 224 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–89.4% all trades, 90.75% on B/E/M/P only
- January, 16: 188 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–85.85% all trades, 84.64% on B/E/M/P only
- February, 16: 219 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–84.88% all trades, 82.75% on B/E/M/P only
- March, 16: 241 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–84% all trades, 85.25% on B/E/M/P only
- April, 16: 240 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–88.38% all trades, 91.25% on B/E/M/P only
- May, 16: 237 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–90.62% all trades, 94.5% on B/E/M/P only
- June, 16: 230 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–91.63% all trades, 95% on B/E/M/P only

Booking Lead Times

- On Schedule Projects: **for reporting chart posted on line**, on July 4, 2016, showed
 - 1-2 hr projects; at 2 work days booking lead, but Bldg-4, CMUD-11 and City Zoning-15 days
 - 3-4 hr projects; at 2-5 work days lead, except MP-7, CMUD-12, and City Zoning 15 days
 - 5-8 hr projects; at 2 work days lead for County Fire & Zoning, all others; Bldg-14, Elec-8, MP-9, CMUD-12, Health-10, City Zoning-24, CFD-12
- CTAC plan review turnaround time; BEMP at 8 work days, and all others at 1 day.
- Express Rev'w booking lead time; 6 work days for small projects, 10 work days for large projects

Follow-up from BDC June Meeting

Launch audit of plan review scope in RDS and CTAC

- First two meetings on RDS held on June 24 and July 15. When RDS is complete, will move on to CTAC.
- Meeting purpose: we do plan review; **to support inspectors' work in the field**; plan reviewers are inspectors' early eyes.
 - However, plan review is a zero sum game, not an unlimited resource.
 - The purpose of the audit meetings is to identify the key issues or details, at an absolute minimum, on which the inspectors need plan review to focus.

Customer Service Center Design project

- CSC Team leadership will periodically update the BDC on CSC detail development status
 - With the opening of the CSC on December 22, this project is 95% complete, with only technology refinement and measurement development remaining.
 - **CSC Manager and Training Coordinator to spearhead work on developing CSC Answer Book, processes and workflows and actual CSC startup.**

Manager/CA added comments

No Manager/CA added comments

10. Adjournment

The July 19th meeting of the Building Development Commission adjourned at 4:43 p.m. The next meeting of the Building Development Commission is scheduled for Tuesday, August 16th 2016.